

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This response is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated December 5, 2008. Applicants appreciate the examination of the present application, as evidenced by the Office Action. The Office Action rejects all pending claims (i.e., claims 1-14, 16, 17, 19-43, and 45-57) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the cited references. In particular, the Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 7-9, 11-14, 16-17, 19-20, 22-25, 29-43, 45-47, and 49-57 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,047,033 to Wyler in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,857,102 to Bickmore. Further, the Office Action rejects claims 4-6 as being unpatentable over Wyler and Bickmore, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,775,689 to Raghunandan. The Office Action also rejects claim 10 as being unpatentable over Wyler and Bickmore, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,973,619 to Hirose, and claims 21 and 48 as being unpatentable over Wyler and Bickmore, in further view of "A Framework for Adaptive Content Delivery in Heterogeneous Network Environments" to Ma. The Office Action also rejects claims 26-28 as being unpatentable over Wyler and Bickmore, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,300,947 to Kanevsky.

As explained below, however, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is patentably distinct from the cited references, taken individually or in any proper combination. Nonetheless, Applicants have amended various ones of the claims to further clarify the claimed invention, including the cancellation of claim 16. Due to the cancellation of claim 16, the rejection of claim 16 is moot. No new matter has been added by the amendments to the claims.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the remarks presented herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all of the pending claims of the present application.

#### **Claims 1-14, 17, 19-43, and 45-57 are Patentable**

In response to the obviousness rejections proffered by the Office Action, Applicants assert that the claimed invention, as amended, is patentable over the cited references, alone or in any proper combination. In this regard, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, applying a hyperlink to the portions of content, the application of the hyperlink being performed in response to

**determining that a location of the hyperlink is separated by at least a predetermined distance from a destination location to which the hyperlink points.** In other words, the distance between the location of the hyperlink and the destination location of the hyperlink (the location to which the hyperlink points) is determined. In response to the determined distance being at least a predefined amount, the hyperlink is applied to the portions of content.

In contrast to the claimed invention, the cited references fail to teach or suggest the application of a hyperlink in response to determining that a distance is at least a predetermined amount as recited in claim 1. In a prior rejection of claim 16, which previously included at least some of the subject matter included in the amended independent claims, the Office Action cited to the disclosure of Wyler. In this regard, the Office Action indicates that Wyler discloses the use of navigation components including a "home" link (not described in the text of the specification, but included in the figures). However, none of the navigation links, including the "home" link disclosed in Wyler or navigation links taught or suggested by combinations of the cited references, are described as being applied in response to a distance determination. Since no distance determination is disclosed, the references also fail to also disclose the use of a threshold distance as described in claim 1. Rather, the navigation links, such as the "home" link appear to be static links that are always available, regardless of the distance between the link and the destination of the link. Accordingly, Wyler does not teach or suggest this claimed feature, and combinations with the remaining cited references do not cure the deficiencies of Wyler. Further, Bickmore, Raghunandan, Ma, and/or Kanevsky are not cited for this purpose.

Claim 1 is therefore patentable over the cited references, alone or in any proper combination. Additionally, since independent claims 36, 38, 41, 47, 53, and 56 include similar recitations to those of claim 1 described above, claims 36, 38, 41, 47, 53, and 56 are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Dependent claims 2-14, 17, 19-35, 37, 39-40, 42-43, 45-52, 54-55, and 57 are also patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons due to their dependency from the patentable independent claims.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the amendments to the claims and the remarks presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. As such, the issuance of a Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested. In order to expedite the examination of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in order to resolve any remaining issues.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,



Nathaniel T. Quirk  
Registration No. 60,676

**Customer No. 00826**  
**ALSTON & BIRD LLP**  
Bank of America Plaza  
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000  
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000  
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000  
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111  
LEGAL02/31059910v1

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON **February 24, 2009**